

Dynamical and topological singularities cross-talk in flowing nematic liquid crystals

Luca Giomi,¹ Žiga Kos,² Miha Ravnik,^{2,3} and Anupam Sengupta^{4,*}

¹*Instituut-Lorentz, Universiteit Leiden, P.O. Box 9506, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands*

²*Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia*

³*Josef Stefan Institute, Ljubljana, Slovenia*

⁴*Institute for Environmental Engineering, Department of Civil, Environmental and Geomatic Engineering, ETH Zurich, Stefano-Franscini-Platz 5, 8093 Zurich, Switzerland*

Dynamical singularities in fluids, also known as stagnation points, have been extensively studied in flows of isotropic liquids, yet, how, and to what extent, a stagnation point can influence the molecular ordering, or the topology of a nematic liquid crystal (NLC) is largely unknown. Here we investigate the emergence of topological singularities in the nematic director field, or a disclination, arising due to a hydrodynamic stagnation in an NLC flowing through star-shaped microfluidic junctions. The regular alternation of inlets and outlets at the junction drives the formation of a stagnation point of topological charge $1 - n$, where $2n$ is the number of arms of the star junction. Using a combination of microfluidic experiments, numerical modeling, and analytical calculations we demonstrate that such a hydrodynamic singularity can nucleate a disclination of equal topological charge. In the case of a simple 4-arm junction ($n = 2$), this central -1 defect forms due to the merging of a pair of traveling $-1/2$ disclinations in each of the inlet arms. At microfluidic junctions with 6- and 8-arm, topological defects of charge -2 and -3 initially nucleate and eventually decay into multistable arrangements of -1 defects. Finally, we demonstrate that manipulating the hydrodynamic stagnation points allows us to dynamically control the spatial arrangement of the nematic disclinations. We attribute this to a coupling interplay between the hydrodynamic stagnation point and the emergent topological defect, and explore the microfluidic setting to quantify the strength of the coupling between dynamical and topological defects.

I. INTRODUCTION

Defects are ubiquitous in nature and lie at the heart of several physical mechanisms, from melting in two-dimensional crystals [1] to symmetry breaking in the early universe [2]. Vortices are possibly the most common example of defects in flowing media and, for centuries, they have stimulated the imagination of scientists, mathematicians and philosophers, as exemplified by the debate between Newton and Descartes on the existence of “swirling vortices” guiding motion of celestial bodies in the solar system [3]. In a typical hydrodynamic vortex, the fluid velocity $\mathbf{v}$ rotates by 2π along any closed loop surrounding the vortex core and has an undefined orientation at the core. More generally, dynamical defects are singular points or lines in a flow around which the velocity field rotates by $2\pi k$, where k is an integer commonly referred to as index, winding number or topological charge. These can be either vortices ($k = 1$), multiplets of vortices ($k = 2, 3 \dots$) or saddle stagnation points of various degree of rotational symmetry ($k = -1, -2 \dots$) [4].

Disclinations in liquid crystals [5–8], dislocations in solids [9], Abrikosov vortices in type II superconductors [10] etc., are only few among the many examples of topological defects in classical and quantum materials. Unlike vortices, however, these defects do not dictate the dynamics of a material element, but rather the spatial

structure of some internal degree of freedom, such as the average molecular orientation, the arrangement of crystalline planes or the magnetic flux. In materials where dynamical and topological defects coexist, it is then natural to ask whether these singularities can affect each other static and dynamical properties and whether controlling one of these two classes of defects can be used to indirectly control the other. In this article we address this problem theoretically and experimentally using nematic liquid crystals. Chemically, NLCs are low molecular-weight organic liquids comprising rod or disk shaped molecules, which, on average, tend to align along a common direction, denoted by a unit vector, $\mathbf{n}$, referred to as nematic director. Disclinations are possibly the most prominent and recognizable feature of nematic liquid crystals [11, 12]. These correspond to singularities in the orientation of the nematic director, around which $\mathbf{n}$ rotates by an integer multiple of π , as exemplified by the two-dimensional director $\mathbf{n} = (\cos \theta, \sin \theta, 0)$, with $\theta = k \arctan(y/x)$ and $k = \pm 1/2, \pm 1 \dots$ [13]. Disclinations can exist as points, lines or wall structures, which under optical microscopes, appear optically distinct due to the scattering of light at the defect core. The core of a topological defect is typically 10 nm in diameter, and has a reduced order relative to the embedding ordered nematic phase [14, 15].

Our experimental apparatus consists of a star-shaped microfluidic device, whose arms cross at a central junction (Fig. 1A), filled with a 5CB nematic liquid crystal (Fig. 1B and Appendix H). We primarily focus on junctions with an even number of arms (4, 6 and 8), such that each inflow arm is flanked by two outflow arms, and

* anupams@ethz.ch




FIG. 1. Emergence of topological defects and hydrodynamic singularities at a microfluidic junction. (A) Generic star-shaped even armed microfluidic junctions. From top: 4-, 6-, and 8-arm microfluidic junctions, and corresponding POM images (B) of the emergent topological defects at the center: -1 (4-arm junction), -2 defect split into two -1 defects (6-arm junction), and -3 defect split into three -1 defects (8-arm junction). The double headed arrows indicate the orientation of the crossed-polarizers. The inflow and outflow arms are indicated by the red and green arrow heads respectively. (C) Epi-fluorescent imaging of flowing fluorescent tracers reveal the hydrodynamic stagnation points at the geometric centers of each microfluidic junction. (D and E) Nematic flows at microfluidic junctions reproduced in numerical simulations. (D) Heatmap and streamlines of flow profile in simulations. The range in which the heatmap of the velocity magnitude is drawn is given in units of nematic correlation length divided by the characteristic nematic time-scale (see Appendix E). (E) The director profile (blue rods) and the isosurface of the nematic scalar order parameter, drawn at $S = 0.4$ in yellow.

vice versa (3- and 5-arm junctions are briefly discussed in Appendix G). Because of the regular alternation of inlets and outlets, the resulting flow contains a stagnation point of topological charge $k = 1 - n$, with $2n$ the number of arms, at the center of the junction (Fig. 1C). By controlling the flow velocity and simultaneously imaging the configuration of the nematic director inside the junction, we demonstrate that stagnation points can nucleate nematic disclinations having the same negative topological charge. Using numerical modeling and analytical calculations, we then show that such a coupling originates from the tendency of the nematic director to align in the direction of the flow. For large strain-rate this effect dominates over elastic repulsion between like-sign disclinations resulting into an effective attraction toward the central stagnation point. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that cross-talk between defects in different material fields is reported in the literature, despite vast volumes of work on topological defects, and dynamical singularities, across the various areas of physics.

II. TUNING TOPOLOGY WITH HYDRODYNAMICS

The central control parameter in our experiments is the so called Ericksen number [7] expressing the competition between viscous and elastic stresses: $Er = \eta vl/K$, where η is the viscosity, v is flow velocity, l the channel hydraulic diameter and K the elastic constant of 5CB. Here $0.4 \lesssim Er \lesssim 70$ (see Appendix H). Fig. 1B shows the sequence of defective structures of increasing topological charge obtained upon flowing 5CB through a 4-, 6- and 8-arm microfluidic junction. In each case, no defect was observed at the center of the junction for $Er < 1$. In the 4-arm junction, the first appearance of a -1 disclination is observed at $Er \approx 2$, and is found to stabilize for $Er > 5$. Fig. 1B (top panel, imaged at $Er \approx 10$) shows a polarization optical micrograph (POM) of a stable disclination of strength -1 , at the center of the junction. Increasing the number of arms to six and eight (Fig. 1B, middle and lower panels respectively), causes the total topological charge in the bulk to increase hierarchically to -2

(imaged at $Er \approx 18$) and -3 (imaged at $Er \approx 22$). However, disclinations of topological charge higher than -1 , could spontaneously break down into multiples of the -1 defects. For instance, the -2 defect at the 6-arm junction decays into a pair of -1 defects, while the -3 defect (in the 8-arm junction) fractionalizes into a triplet of -1 defects. On overlaying the positions of the dynamical and topological defects, in a 4-arm junction, the -1 disclination is found to lie within a micrometer from stagnation point. When averaged over time, the position of the topological defect coincides with that of the stagnation point. In 6- and 8-arm junctions, the defects of higher topological charge (existing as multiples of -1 defect), are found to lie within a hydrodynamic stagnation zone, a central region at the junction over which the flow speed is down to 10% of the far field value.

In order to shed light on these findings, we have reproduced our experiments *in silico*. Fig. 1D and E respectively show the flow velocity and the nematic director at the 4-, 6- and 8-arms junctions. The results are obtained from a numerical integration of the Navier-Stokes equation coupled with the Beris-Edwards equations of nematodynamics [16] (see Appendix E for details). In Fig. 1E, isosurfaces of the nematic order parameter reveal small defect loops. These are equivalent to point defects, both in terms of net topological charge and structure of the director in the far field. Typically, the size and the resolution of experimental micrographs do not allow us to study the microstructure of the defect cores at a length scale of the nematic correlation length. However, using experiments, it was recently proved that the cores of what appears to be a point defect are indeed nanometer-sized defect loops [17].

III. GLOBAL CONSTRAINTS AND LOCAL FORCES

The topological structure emerging at the center of the junction, as revealed by our experimental and numerical findings, results from a combination of global topological constraints and local mechanical effects. The shear flow inside the arms tends to align the director along the arms centerline. This drives the formation of $2n$ disclinations of topological charge $+1/2$ at the corners of the $2n$ -sided polygon representing the central region of the junction (e.g. top row of Fig. 1B). The total topological charge of the junction, however, is constrained by the Poincaré-Hopf theorem [18], by virtue of which: $\sum_i k_i = k_{\text{corners}} + k_{\text{bulk}} = 1$, where the summation runs over all the topological defects in the system. Thus, the topological charge $k_{\text{corners}} = n$, introduced by the $2n$ half-strength disclinations located at the corners, must be compensated by a charge $k_{\text{bulk}} = 1 - n$ in the bulk of the junction. In the case of a 4-arm junction, $k_{\text{corners}} = 2$ and $k_{\text{bulk}} = -1$. For a 6-arm junction, on the other hand, $k_{\text{corners}} = 3$ and $k_{\text{bulk}} = -2$ and so on. At large Ericksen numbers, this negative topological charge




FIG. 2. Singularity cross-talk. (A) The hydrodynamic force field experienced by a two-dimensional disclination of charge -1 , -2 and -3 in confined inside a 4-, 6- and 8-arms junction. The hydrodynamic force, calculated from Eq. (3), results into an effective attraction between the topological defect and the central hydrodynamic stagnation point. Lower panel shows POM images topological defects right after formation: -1 defect loop at a 4-arm, -2 defect at the 6-arm, and the -3 defect at the 8-arm junctions. (B) The -2 and -3 topological defects decay into multiple defects of charge -1 , shown here as a time sequence in the upper and lower panels respectively.

is attracted toward the central stagnation point, due to aligning effect of the flow, at the expense of the system elastic energy. To gain insight on the physical mechanisms behind this process we have looked for defective solutions of the equation governing the dynamics of the nematic director in the presence of a flow [19]. For sake of simplicity, we ignore variations in the direction perpendicular to the plane of the junction, so that, the nematic director can be expressed by the two-dimensional vector-field $\mathbf{n} = (\cos \theta, \sin \theta, 0)$. The dynamics of the angle θ is governed by the following partial differential equation (see Appendix A):

$$(\partial_t + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla) \theta = \frac{K}{\gamma} \nabla^2 \theta - \omega_{xy} + \lambda(u_{xx} \cos 2\theta - u_{xy} \sin 2\theta), \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{v}$ is the flow velocity, $\omega_{ij} = (\partial_i v_j - \partial_j v_i)/2$ and $u_{ij} = (\partial_i v_j + \partial_j v_i)/2$ are respectively the vorticity and strain-rate tensor and γ^{-1} is the rotational viscosity. The constant λ is known as flow-alignment parameter and dictates how the director rotates as effect of a shear flow

[5, 7]. For 5CB, $\lambda \approx 1.1$ and the director orients at an angle $\Delta\theta \approx 13^\circ$ with respect to the flow [20].

Now, due to the symmetry of the junction, the flow is approximately irrotational in proximity of the central stagnation point. In polar coordinates (r, ϕ) , with $r = 0$ representing the center of the junction, an analytical approximation of the flow yields $v_r = v_0(r/\mathcal{R})^{n-1} \cos n\phi$ and $v_\phi = -v_0(r/\mathcal{R})^{n-1} \sin n\phi$, with v_0 the flow speed at the center of the channels and $\mathcal{R}$ a length scale proportional to the channel width (Appendix B). Then, using standard manipulations, one can then prove that, for a perfectly flow-aligning system with $\lambda = 1$, the ideal defective configuration $\theta = (1 - n)\phi$ is an exact solution of Eq. (1) (Appendix C). For $\lambda \gtrsim 1$, the solution departs from this ideal form, but preserves the rotational symmetry.

While the existence of a defective equilibrium configuration depends exclusively on the symmetry of the flow in close proximity of the stagnation point, its stability against the elastic forces depends on the structure of the flow over the entire junction. To clarify this point we have introduced an effective particle model for the dynamics of defects in the presence of a generic potential energy field, as that originating from a background flow at sufficiently large Er . Let us consider the generic free energy $\mathcal{F} = \int dA [K|\nabla\theta|^2/2 + U(\theta)]$, where $U(\theta)$ is a potential energy density, possibly due to the interaction with an externally imposed flow, and let us further assume that the system is populated by a given number of topological defects having position $\mathbf{R}_i = (X_i, Y_i)$ and topological charge k_i . Extending a classic approach by Kawasaki [21] and Denniston [22], one can construct an equation of motion for the moving defect in the form (Appendix D):

$$\dot{\mathbf{R}}_i = \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{R}_i) + \mu_i \left(2\pi K \sum_{j \neq i} k_i k_j \frac{\mathbf{R}_i - \mathbf{R}_j}{|\mathbf{R}_i - \mathbf{R}_j|^2} + \mathbf{F}_i \right), \quad (2)$$

where $\mu_i \sim 1/(\gamma k_i^2)$ is a mobility coefficient. The second term on the right-hand side of Eq. (2), corresponds to the well known Coulomb-like elastic interaction between topological charges [23]. The third term, on the other hand, is given by $\mathbf{F}_i = -\nabla_{\mathbf{R}_i} \int dA U(\theta)$, where the integration is performed over a domain punctured at the locations of the defects, and represents the force experienced by a defect moving in a potential energy field. In the presence of hydrodynamic flow, the latter can be calculated in the form (Appendix D):

$$\mathbf{F}_i = k_i \int dA \frac{\hat{\mathbf{z}} \times (\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_i)}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_i|^2} \times [\omega_{xy} - \lambda(u_{xx} \sin 2\theta - u_{xy} \cos 2\theta)], \quad (3)$$

where θ can be approximated as a linear superposition of the local orientations associated with all the defects: i.e. $\theta(\mathbf{r}) \approx \sum_j k_j \arctan(y - Y_j)/(x - X_j)$. Fig. 2A (upper

panel) shows the force field, calculated via Eq. (3), experienced by a disclination of topological charge -1 , -2 and -3 confined inside a 4-, 6- and 8-arm junction. The corresponding flow field, thus the tensorial elements u_{ij} and ω_{ij} in Eq. (3), have been analytically approximated based on the rotational symmetry of the junctions and the location of the stagnation points (Appendix B).

IV. CHARGE FRACTIONALIZATION AND DEFECTS UNBINDING

As explained in the previous section, the spatial organization of the topological charge in the central region of our microfluidic junctions results from the competition of two effects: on the one hand the hydrodynamic forces tend to localize the negative topological charge in proximity of the central stagnation point. On the other hand, the elastic forces drive the repulsion of the like-sign defects, thus promoting the fractionalization of the bulk topological charge and the unbinding of defects of lower charge. In order to further clarify this phenomenon we have experimentally resolved the dynamics of the central defective region while increasing the Er in steps of 0.5. Fig. 2A (lower panel) shows POM micrographs of the defects immediately after their formation. The defect at the center of the 4-arm junction formed as a -1 defect loop (Fig. 2A lower left panel), which within a short time stabilized into a small loop. Strikingly, the defects in the 6- and the 8-arm junctions, originally emerged as defect loops of topological charge -2 and -3 respectively (Fig. 3A lower middle and right panels) and eventually decay into multiple defects of charge -1 . We stress that the highly charged loops can stably exist only under finely controlled experimental conditions (stable flow rates, uniform and homogeneous surface anchoring and roughness properties, and absence of particulate impurities in the flowing nematic), and slight perturbations can completely hinder their formation.

We have further analyzed the dynamics of charge fractionalization using time lapse POM. As presented in Fig. 2B (upper panel), the -2 triangular loop fractionalizes into two smaller loops of charge -1 and, in about 10 s, stabilized into a pair of -1 disclinations. On the other hand, the fractionalization of the -3 loop (Fig. 2B, lower panel) takes place in three steps: 1) An initial square loop of charge -3 splits into a -2 (triangular) and a -1 loop. 2) As the -1 loop collapses, the -2 triangular loop splits into two -1 loops. 3) The three -1 loops collapse down to the stable -1 defects, completing the fractionalization process. The final configuration remains topologically stable, but its specific geometry can be manipulated by adjusting the hydrodynamic flow (see Appendix H).




FIG. 3. Dynamics of defect nucleation in a 4-arm junction. (A) Evolution of the nematic director field at the junction, revealed by polarization micrographs, acquired at $Er \approx 8$. (B) Polarization micrographs of the director field at different Er captures the transition from a defect-free state to the -1 topological defect at $Er \approx 2$. Upon increasing the Er further, the defect can get stretched, shown here at $Er \gtrsim 5$. (c) Numerical analysis of a increasing Er (flow strength). Inset shows the position and orientation of a cross-section at which the director (blue rods) and scalar order parameter (isosurface at $S = 0.4$) are plotted. Upper panel shows a slight bend of the director along the flow direction at the maximum speed in a channel, $v_{\max} = 0.11 \xi_N/\tau_N$. At $v_{\max} = 0.29 \xi_N/\tau_N$, a small defect loop forms at the junction center once the flow-aligned director field has been established (middle panel), and a vertically stretched defect loop is observed at an even higher speed (lower panel). (D, E) Continuous, defect-free director field observed in specific inflow-outflow combinations, in experiments (upper panel) and simulations (middle and lower panels). The nematic texture and the director field are confirmed by simulations. (F, G) When symmetrical flow conditions are restored at the 4-arm junction (each inflow arm is flanked by 2 outflow arms), a point defect emerges. The defect is positioned exactly at the geometric center of the junction when the flow speed in all the arms are equal (G).

V. DYNAMICS OF DEFECT NUCLEATION IN A 4-ARM JUNCTION

In this section we look more closely at the dynamics of the nucleation process. Because to the higher stability of -1 disclinations, compared to -2 and -3 , 4-arm junctions are particularly well suited for this goal. Our approach consists of two different experimental protocols. In the first one, we drive flow in the left and right arm simultaneously (Fig. 3), at Er larger than the minimum Er required for a stable -1 defect. Fig. 3A shows the evolution of the nematic director in time at $Er \approx 8$. Upon starting the flow, the nematic director in each inflow arm rapidly aligns along the flow. However, further downstream, the director field is still relatively undisturbed. Consequently, these two domains are separated by a defect line of topological charge $-1/2$ that moves downstream [20, 25] in each of the inflow arms. Finally, the two defect lines meet at the junction center (see Fig. 3A, middle panel) and merge, giving rise to the -1 defect loop (Fig. 3A, fourth panel from the top), which finally equilibrates to a stable -1 disclination.

In the second protocol, we increase the Er in steps of 0.5 in each inflow arm and, for each Er value, we allow the director field to equilibrate before increasing it further. Fig. 3B, presents the sequence of POM images

of the equilibrium configuration at the junction center over a range of Er values. The first appearance of the -1 defect loop was recorded at $Er \approx 2$. At higher Er , -1 defect loop remains spatially locked at the center of the junction, but can get stretched along either one (Fig. 3B, panels 4 and 5 from top) or both of the outflow arms. In order to gain further insight into the nucleation dynamics, we simulated the same protocol numerically (Fig. 3C). At low Er , the orientation of the director in the arms of the junction is firmly dictated by the anchoring conditions and only slightly perturbed by the flow. Increasing the Er causes a progressive tilt of the nematic director in the direction of the channel until, for large Er values, the system attains a flow-aligned state, with the nematic director roughly parallel to the channel direction. As the two flow-aligned domains meet at the center of the junction, the mismatch in the nematic director leads to the formation of a small defective loop of charge -1 (Fig. 3C, middle panel). At much higher Er values, the flow dictates the structure of the nematic director even in the close proximity of a defect. The loop then flips vertically and even stretches as a consequence to the viscous forces (Fig. 3C, bottom panel).

A stable -1 disclination can also emerge by virtue of specific modulation of the flow at the center of the 4-arm junction. As shown in Fig. 3D, the combination

of 3 inflow arms (left, right and top), and 1 outflow arm (bottom), results into a defect-free configuration at the junction center. However, upon turning the inflow off in the top arm (Fig. 3E), the system gradually reorganizes and, as symmetric outflow conditions are restored, it transitions to a defective configuration (Fig. 3F-G).

VI. INTERACTION STRENGTH

In this section we quantify the strength of the interaction between dynamical and topological defects in a 4-junction. To this purpose we perturb a stationary system, with both the disclination and the stagnation point positioned at the center of the junction, by slightly altering the pressure in one of the inflow arms. This perturbation causes a sudden displacement of the stagnation point, later followed by the recovery of the nematic director. Fig. 4A,B shows the typical dynamics induced by this procedure in our numerical simulations. Once the stagnation point and the defect are separated (Fig. 4A, left panel), the latter starts moving toward the stagnation point and, in a time 10^3 times larger than the typical relaxation time scale of the nematic phase, the stagnation point and the disclination overlap again. Altering the pressure in one of the outflow arms also causes a sudden displacement of the stagnation point followed by the recovery of the -1 disclination (Fig. 4C,D), but, as the defect now moves against the flow, the recovery is 10 times slower than in the previous case. Furthermore, the disclination initially moves backward before starting its progression toward the stagnation point new location.

The above predictions can be tested with our apparatus, by changing the inlet pressure in one of the inflow arms of the 4-arm junction. Fig. 4E (top panel) shows the stationary system where the topological defect and the stagnation point are stably positioned at the center of the junction. The image processed micrograph is obtained by overlaying consecutive frames of a video data, thus capturing the transport of tracer particles (bright dots along the flow direction), and the position of the defect over time (indicated by the yellow arrow head). The bright dots mark the trajectory of a tracer particle and their separation corresponds to the distance traveled over a given time interval. In Fig. 4E (top panel), the speed in the left inflow arm is $\approx 24 \mu\text{m/s}$ and the defect remains at the center of the junction (no shift) together with the stagnation point (Fig. 4F). Increasing the inlet pressure in the left arm (4E middle panel, flow speed of $\approx 62 \mu\text{m/s}$) results into a rapid shift of the stagnation point (Fig. 4F inset micrograph, Pressure increase 1) by $\approx 40 \mu\text{m}$. Interestingly, the topological defect remained spatially locked at the center of the junction, with no effective shift. However, upon increasing the inlet pressure further (flow speed of $\approx 180 \mu\text{m/s}$), the defect shifted by $\approx 90 \mu\text{m}$, as shown in Fig. 4E (bottom panel), and finally overlapped with the stagnation point new position (Fig. 4F, Pressure increase 2 micrograph). When releas-




FIG. 4. Interaction between topological and dynamical singularities. (A) Simulations show displacement of the topological defect and the hydrodynamic stagnation point when the pressure at the left arm of the junction was increased. The stagnation point is almost instantaneously adapted to the new pressure boundary conditions, and shifts to a new position. This is followed by a much slower shift of the nematic defect. Before the pressure pulse is turned off (3rd panel from left), the stagnation point and nematic defect are once again completely aligned. After the pressure boundary conditions are restored, the stagnation point once again quickly shifts back to the original position and the nematic defect slowly follows. (B) The exact position of the stagnation point and nematic defect in time. (C, D) When the pressure in the bottom arm is decreased, the nematic defect first drifts opposite relative to shift of the stagnation point (against the flow). However, at longer times the nematic defect starts to approach the stagnation point and eventually they overlay. (E, F) The increased pressure pulse was also performed in an experiment, showing behavior which is quantitatively similar to those in the simulations. Here also, the hydrodynamic stagnation point undergoes an instantaneous shift, and the nematic defect gradually drifts towards the stagnation point.

ing the pressure (flow speed $\approx 24 \mu\text{m/s}$), the stagnation points rapidly returns at the center of the junction, later followed by the -1 disclination, for a total recovery time of ≈ 4 s, by the (Fig. 4F).

VII. CONCLUSION

In this work we have investigated the interplay between defects from different material fields: hydrodynamic stagnation point and topological defects. Using flow experiments, numerical modeling, and analytical calculations, we have shown that hydrodynamic stagnation point creates topological defects in a flowing nematic liquid crystal within a generic star shaped microfluidic channel (alternate inflow and outflow). The strength of the de-

fects could be hierarchically controlled using appropriate microfluidic geometry. Importantly, using experiments, we demonstrate that dynamical and topological defects cross-talk, and we quantify the interaction strength using numerical modeling. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first report on interaction between defects of hydrodynamic and topological origin. Given that dynamical and topological defects coexist in a wide range of materials, this work will serve as a first step towards understanding if singularities of one type can influence the static and dynamical properties of the other type, or if they can be harnessed to modulate attributes of the other type.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

LG's work is supported by The Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO/OCW). MR and ZK are supported by the Slovenian Research Agency ARRS, through Grants No. Z1-5441 and No. P1-0099, and EU FP7 Career Integration Grant FREEFLUID. AS thanks numerous helpful discussions with Stephan Herminghaus and Christian Bahr at different stages of this work, and the Human Frontier Science Program Cross Disciplinary Fellowship for financial support.

Appendix A: Nematodynamics

In this appendix we provide additional information on the hydrodynamics of nematic liquid crystals as well as a derivation of Eq. (1) in the main text. In the presence of uniform density and orientational order, the dynamic of a nematic liquid crystal can be described by the following set of partial differential equations for the velocity field $\mathbf{v}$ and the nematic director $\mathbf{n}$ [5–8, 19]:

$$\rho(\partial_t + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{v} = \eta \nabla^2 \mathbf{v} - \nabla p + \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\text{el}}, \quad (\text{A1a})$$

$$(\partial_t + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{n} + \boldsymbol{\omega} \cdot \mathbf{n} = \boldsymbol{\Pi} \cdot (\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} + \gamma^{-1} \mathbf{h}), \quad (\text{A1b})$$

where $u_{ij} = (\partial_i v_j + \partial_j v_i)/2$ and $\omega_{ij} = (\partial_i v_j - \partial_j v_i)/2$ are the strain-rate and vorticity tensor and $\Pi_{ij} = \delta_{ij} - n_i n_j$ is the transverse projection operator. The constants η and γ are the shear and rotational viscosity, while λ is the flow-aligning parameter discussed in the main text. The relaxational dynamics of the nematic director is dictated by the molecular field $\mathbf{h} = -\delta \mathcal{F}_F / \delta \mathbf{n}$ associated with the Frank free energy:

$$\mathcal{F}_F = \frac{1}{2} \int dV \left[K_1 (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{n})^2 + K_2 (\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla \times \mathbf{n})^2 + K_3 |\mathbf{n} \times \nabla \times \mathbf{n}|^2 \right], \quad (\text{A2})$$

where K_1 , K_2 and K_3 are respectively the splay, twist and bending elastic constants. In one elastic constant approximation $K_1 = K_2 = K_3 = K$ and the molecular

tensor is $\mathbf{h} = K \nabla^2 \mathbf{n}$. Finally, the elastic stress tensor is given by [6, 19]:

$$\sigma_{ij}^{\text{el}} = -\frac{\lambda}{2} (n_i h_j^\perp + n_j h_i^\perp) + \frac{1}{2} (n_i h_j^\perp - n_j h_i^\perp), \quad (\text{A3})$$

where $\mathbf{h}^\perp = \boldsymbol{\Pi} \cdot \mathbf{h}$. In all our analytical calculations we have neglected variations in the direction perpendicular to the plane of the junction, thus rendering the problem effectively two-dimensional. As we anticipated in the main text and we will see in more detail in Appendix F, this assumption does not allow to capture the escaped structure of the defect loops with topological charge $k \leq -2$, but does provide crucial insight in our understanding the mechanisms governing the interaction between dynamical and topological defects. Taking $\mathbf{n} = (\cos \theta, \sin \theta, 0)$ in (A1b) yields Eq. (1). The flow aligning behavior of nematics becomes especially evident in the presence of a simple shear flow of the form $\mathbf{v} = (0, \dot{\epsilon} y, 0)$, with $\dot{\epsilon}$ a constant shear-rate. Eq. (1) then reduces to:

$$(\partial_t + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla)\theta = \frac{K}{\gamma} \nabla^2 \theta - \frac{\dot{\epsilon}}{2} (1 - \lambda \cos 2\theta). \quad (\text{A4})$$

Thus, sufficiently far from the boundary and for $\lambda \geq 1$, the director aligns at a constant angle $\theta = \arccos(1/\lambda)/2$ with respect to the flow direction [5, 7].

Appendix B: Stagnation flows in $2n$ -arm junctions

The defective solutions and the force field reported in the main text have been constructed from analytic approximations of the stagnation flow in a 4-, 6- and 8-arm junction. In this Appendix we report an explicit construction of the corresponding velocity fields. Let $\mathbf{v} = (\partial_y \psi, -\partial_x \psi)$ be the two-dimensional velocity field in the mid-plane of the junction, with ψ the associated stream function. In Eq. (A1a), the ratio between the magnitude $\eta v/l$ of viscous stresses, with v the typical flow velocity and l the system size, and the magnitude K/l^2 of elastic stresses, yields the Ericksen number $\text{Er} = \eta v l / K$, whereas $\text{Re} = \rho v l / \eta$ is the usual Reynolds number expressing the ratio between inertial and viscous force. For $\text{Re} \approx 0$ and $\text{Er} \gg 1$, both inertial and elastic effects can be neglected in Eq. (A1a) and the flow is governed by the incompressible Stokes equations:

$$\eta \nabla^2 \mathbf{v} - \nabla p = \mathbf{0}, \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0. \quad (\text{B1})$$

Consistently, the streamfunction ψ obeys to the biharmonic equation [4]:

$$\nabla^4 \psi = 0. \quad (\text{B2})$$

Now, in order to construct an analytical approximation of the flow at the center of the junction, we look for the lowest order biharmonic stream function with the rotational symmetry of the junction and whose stagnation




FIG. 5. Comparison between the theoretical prediction of the flow field $\vec{v}_{\text{theory}}$ and the simulated flow field $\vec{v}_{\text{sim}}$ at the horizontal cross section of the (A) 4-junction, (B) 6-junction, and (C) 8-junction. Results are rescaled to give the same flow rate through the channels on the cross-section. Theoretical approximation shows higher flow rate at the center of the channels and smaller flow rate near the corners.

points are suitably located. As a starting point, let us consider a square domain of size w representing the central region of a 4-arm junction. Due to the symmetry of the inlets and outlets, the velocity field in the junction is characterized by the following symmetries:

$$v_x(x, y) = -v_y(y, x), \quad (\text{B3a})$$

$$v_x(x, y) = -v_x(-x, y), \quad (\text{B3b})$$

as well as those derived from these equations. Eq. (B3a), in particular, implies:

$$\psi(x, y) = \psi(y, x). \quad (\text{B4})$$

Consistently with this property, we can parametrize ψ with two functions f and g , such that:

$$\psi(x, y) = f(x)g(y) + f(y)g(x). \quad (\text{B5})$$

By virtue of Eq. (B3b), both f and g must be odd functions, i.e. $f(x) = -f(-x)$, which in turn implies f' to be an even function, i.e. $f'(x) = f'(-x)$. Following our calculation scheme, we choose $g(x) = x$ to obtain the lowest order stream function. The velocity field is then given by:

$$v_x(x, y) = f(x) + x f'(y), \quad (\text{B6a})$$

$$v_y(x, y) = -f(y) - y f'(x), \quad (\text{B6b})$$

while the biharmonic equation can be cast into the form:

$$x \partial_y^4 f(y) + y \partial_x^4 f(x) = 0. \quad (\text{B7})$$

Due to the separation of variables in Eq. (B7), the function f must be a third-order polynomial of the form:

$$f(x) = a_1 x + a_3 x^3. \quad (\text{B8})$$

The coefficients in Eq. (B8), a_1 and a_3 , can be determined by fixing the position of the stagnation points. The flow in a symmetric cross-junction with alternating

inlets and outlets has in fact five stagnating point. One at the center of the junction and four at the corners, i.e. $(\pm w/2, \pm w/2)$, due to the no-slip walls (Fig. 5A). The flow described by Eqs. (B8) and (B6) has at most 9 stagnation points, whose coordinates are given by:

$$\mathbf{r}_0 = (0, 0), \quad (\text{B9a})$$

$$\mathbf{r}_1^\pm = \left(0, \pm \sqrt{-\frac{2a_1}{a_3}}\right), \quad (\text{B9b})$$

$$\mathbf{r}_2^\pm = \left(\pm \sqrt{-\frac{2a_1}{a_3}}, 0\right), \quad (\text{B9c})$$

$$\mathbf{r}_3^\pm = \left(\pm \sqrt{-\frac{a_1}{2a_3}}, \pm \sqrt{-\frac{a_1}{2a_3}}\right). \quad (\text{B9d})$$

The four symmetric stagnation points at $\mathbf{r}_3^\pm$ are suitable to be mapped into the points at the corners of the junction. Thus, taking:

$$-\frac{a_1}{2a_3} = \left(\frac{w}{2}\right)^2, \quad (\text{B10})$$

we finally obtain the function f in the form:

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{2} a_3 x (w^2 - 2x^2). \quad (\text{B11})$$

The last constant a_3 , can be finally related with the maximal absolute velocity v_0 in the junction. This is attained by the flow at the center of the inlets/outlets, i.e. $(0, \pm w/2)$ and $(\pm w/2, 0)$. Eqs. (B6) and (B11) yields $v_0 = (3/8)w^3 a_3$, from which we obtain:

$$\psi(x, y) = \frac{8v_0}{3w^2} xy(w^2 - x^2 - y^2). \quad (\text{B12})$$

The corresponding velocity field is given by:

$$v_x(x, y) = \frac{8v_0}{3w^3} x (w^2 - x^2 - 3y^2), \quad (\text{B13a})$$

$$v_y(x, y) = -\frac{8v_0}{3w^3} y (w^2 - y^2 - 3x^2). \quad (\text{B13b})$$

Fig. 5A shows a comparison between the approximated velocity field and a numerical solution of the Stokes equation in a cross junction. The agreement is always very satisfactory except in proximity of the corners where the viscous dissipation dominates.

Now, consistently with Eq. (B13), the vorticity field obtained from the approximation described here is the lowest order harmonic function with two-fold rotational symmetry:

$$\omega = \partial_x v_y - \partial_y v_x = \frac{32v_0}{w^3} xy \propto r^2 \sin 2\phi. \quad (\text{B14})$$

This result can be generalized to construct a n -fold symmetric stagnation flows approximating the flows in symmetric $2n$ -arm microfluidic junctions. Let us consider the following stream-function:

$$\psi = Ar^n(1 + Br^2) \sin n\phi, \quad (\text{B15})$$

where A and B are constants and $n \geq 2$ an integer. The corresponding vorticity is given by:

$$\omega = -\nabla^2 \psi \propto r^n \sin n\phi. \quad (\text{B16})$$

This is the lowest order harmonic function with n -fold rotational symmetry [i.e. $\omega(\phi) = \omega(\phi + 2\pi/n)$]. As for the case of a cross-junction, the constants A and B can be adjusted in order to obtain the right positioning of the stagnation points and the maximal absolute velocity. Proceeding as in the previous case, one can obtain, after some algebra:

$$\psi = \frac{v_0}{n} \frac{r^n}{\rho^{n-1}} \frac{R^2(n+2) - nr^2}{R^2(n+2) - n\rho^2} \sin n\phi, \quad (\text{B17})$$

where $\rho = (w/2) \cot \pi/(2n)$ and $R = (w/2) \csc \pi/(2n)$ are respectively the inradius and the circumradius of the regular $2n$ -sided polygon of edge length w representing the center of the junction. The velocity field constructed from Eq. (B17) vanishes at the corners of the polygon and is maximal in magnitude at the center of the edges. This can be conveniently verified using polar coordinates:

$$v_r = v_0 \left(\frac{r}{\rho} \right)^{n-1} \frac{R^2(n+2) - nr^2}{R^2(n+2) - n\rho^2} \cos n\phi, \quad (\text{B18a})$$

$$v_\phi = -v_0 \left(\frac{r}{\rho} \right)^{n-1} \frac{(n+2)(r^2 - R^2)}{R^2(n+2) - n\rho^2} \sin n\phi. \quad (\text{B18b})$$

Now, at the corners of the junction:

$$r = R, \quad \phi = \frac{\pi}{n} \left(i + \frac{1}{2} \right), \quad v_r = v_\phi = 0,$$

with $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. On the other hand, at the center an inlet/outlet:

$$r = \rho, \quad \phi = \frac{\pi}{n}(i+1), \quad v_r = v_0 \cos \pi(i+1), \quad v_\phi = 0.$$

A comparison between the velocity fields described by Eqs. (B18) and those obtained from a numerical integration of the Navier-Stokes equation are shown in Fig. 5C,D for the cases $n = 3, 4$.

Finally, sufficiently close to the central stagnation point $r \ll R$ and the stream function of Eq. (B17) is approximated by the harmonic function:

$$\psi \approx \frac{v_0}{n} \frac{r^n}{\mathcal{R}^{n-1}} \sin n\phi, \quad (\text{B19})$$

where the length scale $\mathcal{R}$ is given by:

$$\mathcal{R} = \rho \left[1 - \frac{n}{n+2} \left(\frac{\rho}{R} \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{n-1}}. \quad (\text{B20})$$

Eq. (B19) describes an irrotational flow (i.e. $\omega = 0$), whose velocity field is given by:

$$v_r = v_0 \left(\frac{r}{\mathcal{R}} \right)^{n-1} \cos n\phi, \quad (\text{B21a})$$

$$v_\phi = -v_0 \left(\frac{r}{\mathcal{R}} \right)^{n-1} \sin n\phi, \quad (\text{B21b})$$

Appendix C: Defective bulk configurations in irrotational flows

In this appendix we use nematic hydrodynamics to calculate the configuration of the nematic director in close proximity of the central stagnation point of a generic $2n$ -arm junction. Under these conditions, the flow is approximately irrotational with a velocity field given by Eqs. (B21). The dynamics of a two-dimensional nematic director is governed by Eq. (1). Because of the rotational symmetry of the problem it is convenient to work in polar coordinates. Then, expressing $\mathbf{n} = \cos \alpha \hat{\mathbf{r}} + \sin \alpha \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}$, with $\alpha = \theta - \phi$, allows to rewrite Eq. (1) as:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \alpha + v_r \partial_r \alpha + \frac{v_\phi}{r} \partial_\phi \alpha + \frac{v_\phi}{r} \\ = \frac{K}{\gamma} \nabla^2 \alpha - \lambda (u_{rr} \sin 2\alpha - u_{r\phi} \cos 2\alpha). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C1})$$

The strain-rates u_{rr} and $u_{r\phi}$ can be straightforwardly calculated from Eqs. (B21):

$$u_{rr} = -u_{\phi\phi} = (n-1) \frac{v_0}{\mathcal{R}} \left(\frac{r}{\mathcal{R}} \right)^{n-2} \cos n\phi, \quad (\text{C2a})$$

$$u_{r\phi} = u_{\phi r} = -(n-1) \frac{v_0}{\mathcal{R}} \left(\frac{r}{\mathcal{R}} \right)^{n-2} \sin n\phi. \quad (\text{C2b})$$

In order to render Eq. (C1) dimensionless, we can rescale $r \rightarrow r/\mathcal{R}$, $t \rightarrow t/\tau_{\mathcal{R}}$, with $\tau_{\mathcal{R}} = \gamma \mathcal{R}^2/K$ the typical relaxational time the nematic director over the length scale $\mathcal{R}$. Thus, using Eqs. (C2), after some manipulation Eq. (C1) can be expressed in the dimensionless form:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \alpha + r^{n-1} \cos n\phi \partial_r \alpha - r^{n-2} \sin n\phi (\partial_\phi \alpha + 1) \\ = \text{De}^{-1} \nabla^2 \alpha - \lambda (n-1) r^{n-2} \sin(2\alpha + n\phi), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C3})$$

where $De = \gamma v_0 \mathcal{R}/K$ is the Deborah number expressing the product between the shear rate $v/\mathcal{R}$ and the relaxation time $\tau_{\mathcal{R}}$.

In spite of its strong nonlinearity, it is possible to find a family of stationary defective solutions of Eq. (C3) for specific values of the flow-alignment parameter λ . To see this, let us consider an ideal defective configuration of strength k . In polar coordinates this is described by:

$$\alpha = (k-1)\phi + \alpha_0. \quad (\text{C4})$$

Replacing this into Eq. (C3) we obtain:

$$k \sin n\phi = \lambda(n-1) \sin[(2k-2+n)\phi + \alpha_0]. \quad (\text{C5})$$

This equation must hold for any ϕ value. Thus, setting without loss of generality $\alpha_0 = 0$, we obtain the following conditions for k and λ :

$$\begin{cases} n = \pm(2k-2+n), \\ k = \pm\lambda(n-1). \end{cases} \quad (\text{C6})$$

Choosing the positive sign, results into a single physical solution:

$$k = 1, \quad \lambda = \frac{1}{n-1}. \quad (\text{C7})$$

As $n \leq 2$, $\lambda \leq 1$, thus Eq. (C7) describes a special bulk configuration of the director in flow-tumbling nematics. Choosing the negative sign in Eq. (C6), on the other hand, yields a family of solutions with:

$$k = 1 - n, \quad \lambda = 1. \quad (\text{C8})$$

Eqs. (C8) defines a set of defective configurations having $k < 0$ and whose rotational symmetry is related to that of the flow field, namely:

$$\alpha = -n\phi. \quad (\text{C9})$$

Thus, in the presence of a cross-flow ($n = 2$), a possible configuration consists of an isolated disclination of turning number $k = -1$ trapped by the flow at the center of the junction. For a hexagonal flow ($n = 3$), the central defects has turning number $k = -2$ and so on. These ideal defective configurations, however, only exist for perfectly flowing aligning nematics, for which $\lambda = 1$. Although mathematically very special, this solution describes, at least approximatively, the majority of thermotropic nematic liquid crystals for which $\lambda \gtrsim 1$. In the case of the 5CB used in our experiment, $\lambda \approx 1.1$ [20].

Appendix D: Defect dynamics in a flow

In this section we provide a derivation of Eq. (2) in the main text. In the absence of backflow, the dynamics of the local orientation θ , governed by Eq. (1), can be thought as resulting solely from energy relaxation:

$$\partial_t \theta = -\frac{1}{\gamma} \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \theta}, \quad (\text{D1})$$




FIG. 6. The force field $\mathbf{F}$ experienced by a negative (left) and positive (right) disclination as a consequence of the flow, calculated using Eqs. (D3), (D18) and (D19). The blue (red) dots represents the trajectory of a negative (positive) disclination starting from a generic circled point in the square region at the center of the junction. Negative defects are attracted by the central stagnation point, while positive disclinations are repelled toward the channels.

where:

$$\mathcal{F} = \int dA \left[\frac{1}{2} K |\nabla \theta|^2 + U(\theta) \right], \quad (\text{D2})$$

and $U(\theta)$ is a potential energy density, such that:

$$U'(\theta) = -\omega_{xy} + \lambda(u_{xx} \sin 2\theta - u_{xy} \cos 2\theta), \quad (\text{D3})$$

where the prime denotes partial differentiation with respect to θ . We stress that such a description is possible here exclusively for $Er \gg 1$. In this regime, the director is reoriented by the flow, while the latter is insensitive to the conformation of the director. The effect of the flow on the dynamics of the nematic director is then equivalent to that of a static external field. More generally, Eqs. (D1) and (D2) can be used to describe the dynamics of the local orientation θ in the presence of any potential energy field, as that associated with an external magnetic or electric field.

Let $\mathbf{R} = (X, Y)$ be the position of an isolated defect of topological charge k , traveling across the system as dictated by Eq. (D1). Following Kawasaki [21] and Deniston [22], one can construct an equation of motion for the moving defect by decomposing the local orientation θ as:

$$\theta(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{R}) = \theta_d(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{R}) + \theta_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r}). \quad (\text{D4})$$

The field θ_d describes the orientation of the director in the neighborhood of the defect core and is such that:

$$\theta_d(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{R}) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{r} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}} k \arctan \left(\frac{y - Y}{x - X} \right), \quad (\text{D5})$$

whereas θ_{ext} represents the departure from this configuration away from the core. In order to find an equation of motion relating $\mathbf{R}$, with θ_d and θ_{ext} , we calculate the




FIG. 7. Loop defects in 4-, 6-, and 8-junction. (A) In a 4-junction a defect loop is shrink to the radius of few ξ_N , effectively being a point defect. (B) Loop in a 6-junction with a topological charge of -2 . (C) Loop in a 8-junction with a topological charge of -3 .

energy variation due to a small virtual displacement $\delta \mathbf{R}$ of the defect:

$$\int dA \delta\theta \partial_t \theta = -\frac{1}{\gamma} \delta \mathcal{F}, \quad (\text{D6})$$

where $\delta\theta$ represent the variation in the director orientation caused by the defect displacement and the integral is performed over a punctured domain which excludes the defect core. Now, the energy variation $\delta \mathcal{F}$ in Eq. (D6) consists of a combination of a bulk term and a boundary term due to the shift in the position of the finite size core region. Namely:

$$\delta \mathcal{F} = \int dA [K \nabla \theta \cdot \nabla \delta\theta + U'(\theta) \delta\theta] + \oint ds \delta \mathbf{R} \cdot \mathbf{N} \left[\frac{1}{2} K |\nabla \theta|^2 + U(\theta) \right], \quad (\text{D7})$$

where $\mathbf{N}$ is the boundary normal pointing toward the interior of the defect core. The variation $\delta\theta$ due to the defect displacement can be straightforwardly calculated from Eqs. (D4) and (D5) in the form:

$$\delta\theta = -\delta \mathbf{R} \cdot \nabla \theta_d. \quad (\text{D8})$$

Replacing this into Eq. (D7), using Eqs. (D4) and (D5) and taking into account that $\nabla^2 \theta_d = 0$, yields, up to terms of order of the defect core radius a :

$$\delta \mathcal{F} = \delta \mathbf{R} \cdot \left\{ \int dA \nabla \theta_d [K \nabla^2 \theta_{\text{ext}} - U'(\theta)] + K \oint ds (\mathbf{N} \nabla \theta_d - \nabla \theta_d \mathbf{N}) \cdot \nabla \theta_{\text{ext}} \right\} + \mathcal{O}(a), \quad (\text{D9})$$

where we have approximated $|\nabla \theta_{\text{ext}}|^2 \approx 0$. The $\mathcal{O}(a)$ contributions result from the contour integral of the potential energy $U(\theta)$ and can be ignored for sufficiently small defects core. Next, assuming the defect core to be circular and setting up a local system of polar coordinate (ϱ, φ) originating at the defect location, so that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\varrho}} = -\mathbf{N}$,

$\nabla \theta_d = k/a \hat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}$ and $ds = a d\varphi$, the contour integral in Eq. (D9) can be straightforwardly calculated:

$$\oint ds (\mathbf{N} \nabla \theta_d - \nabla \theta_d \mathbf{N}) \cdot \nabla \theta_{\text{ext}} = k \int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi (\hat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\varrho}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\varrho}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}) \cdot \nabla \theta_{\text{ext}} = 2\pi k \nabla_{\perp} \theta_{\text{ext}}, \quad (\text{D10})$$

where $\nabla_{\perp} = (-\partial_y, \partial_x)$ and we have taken and assumed $\nabla \theta_{\text{ext}}$ so be constant along the core boundary. Furthermore, using the fact that $\nabla \theta_d = -\nabla_{\mathbf{R}} \theta_d$, where $\nabla_{\mathbf{R}}$ represents a gradient with respect to the coordinates of the core, and that $\nabla_{\mathbf{R}} \theta_{\text{ext}} = 0$, Eq. (D9) can be rearranged in the form:

$$\delta \mathcal{F} = \delta \mathbf{R} \cdot \left\{ 2\pi k K \nabla_{\perp} \theta_{\text{ext}} + K \int dA \nabla \theta_d \nabla^2 \theta_{\text{ext}} + \nabla_{\mathbf{R}} \int dA U(\theta) \right\} + \mathcal{O}(a). \quad (\text{D11})$$

Now, taking $\delta \mathbf{R} = (\dot{\mathbf{R}} - \mathbf{v}) dt + \mathcal{O}(dt^2)$ in Eq. (D8), with $\dot{\mathbf{R}} = \partial_t \mathbf{R}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ the flow velocity, we can express the time derivative $\partial_t \theta$ as a function of the defect velocity. Namely:

$$\partial_t \theta = -(\dot{\mathbf{R}} - \mathbf{v}) \cdot \nabla \theta_d. \quad (\text{D12})$$

This allows to express the left-hand side of Eq. (D6) in the form:

$$\int dA \delta\theta \partial_t \theta = \delta \mathbf{R} \cdot \left(\int dA \nabla \theta_d \nabla \theta_d \right) \cdot (\dot{\mathbf{R}} - \mathbf{v}). \quad (\text{D13})$$

Finally, combining this with Eq. (D11), we obtain an equation of motion for the moving defects:

$$\zeta \cdot (\dot{\mathbf{R}} - \mathbf{v}) = -2\pi k K \nabla_{\perp} \theta_{\text{ext}} - K \int dA \nabla \theta_d \nabla^2 \theta_{\text{ext}} - \nabla_{\mathbf{R}} \int dA U(\theta). \quad (\text{D14})$$

where:

$$\zeta = \gamma \int dA \nabla \theta_d \nabla \theta_d, \quad (\text{D15})$$

is an effective drag tensor. As shown in Ref. [22], this can be explicitly calculated by expressing Eq. (D1) in the frame of the moving defects. This yields: $\zeta_{ij} = \zeta \delta_{ij}$, with:

$$\zeta \approx \pi \gamma k^2 \log \left(\frac{3.6}{\mathcal{E}} \right), \quad (\text{D16})$$

with $\mathcal{E} = \gamma a |\dot{\mathbf{R}}|/K$. In first approximation, $\log(3.6/\mathcal{E}) \approx 1$ as a defect typically moves by a few core radii within the nematic relaxational time scale, thus $|\dot{\mathbf{R}}| \approx a/\tau_a$, with $\tau_a = \gamma a^2/K$.

The dynamics of an isolated defect is then dictated by two driving forces: the elastic force, proportional to the elastic constant K , which tends to reorient the defect velocity depending to the far field orientation θ_{ext} , and the force $-\nabla_{\mathbf{R}} \int dA U(\theta)$, which drives the defect toward the minima of the potential energy. A special scenario, is obtained when θ_{ext} consists of the orientation field of other topological defects. In this case, one can approximate:

$$\theta(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_i \theta_d(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{R}_i), \quad (\text{D17})$$

where the sum runs over all the defects in the system. Thus, for each of them, $\theta_{\text{ext},i}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{j \neq i} \theta_d(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{R}_j)$ and Eq. (D14) yields Eq. (2), with $\mu_i = 1/\zeta_i \approx 1/(\gamma k_i^2)$. The force $\mathbf{F}_i$ is given by:

$$\mathbf{F}_i = -\nabla_{\mathbf{R}_i} \int dA U(\theta) = -k_i \int dA \frac{\hat{\mathbf{z}} \times (\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_i)}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_i|^2} U'(\theta). \quad (\text{D18})$$

Finally, expressing $U'(\theta)$ as given by Eq. (D3) we obtain Eq. (3).

As an example of the effect of a high-Er flow on the motion of a defect, we consider the simple case of a 4-arm junction, whose velocity field is approximated by Eqs. (B13). The corresponding strain-rates and vorticity are given by:

$$u_{xx} = \frac{8v_0}{3w^3} [w^2 - 3(x^2 + y^2)], \quad (\text{D19a})$$

$$u_{xy} = 0, \quad (\text{D19b})$$

$$\omega_{xy} = \frac{16v_0}{w^3} xy. \quad (\text{D19c})$$

Fig. 6 shows the force field experienced by a ± 1 disclination at the center of a 4-arm junction and calculated via Eqs. (D3), (D18) and (D19). As consequence of such a force field, negative defects are attracted by the central stagnation point, while positive disclinations are repelled toward the channels.

Appendix E: Numerical simulations

Our numerical simulations relies on Beris-Edwards formulation of nematodynamics [16] describing the evolution of the system density ρ , velocity $\mathbf{v}$ and nematic tensor $Q_{ij} = (S/2)(3n_i n_j - \delta_{ij})$, with S the nematic order parameter:

$$\partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v}) = 0, \quad (\text{E1a})$$

$$\rho(\partial_t + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{v} = \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \quad (\text{E1b})$$

$$(\partial_t + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{S} = \Gamma \mathbf{H}. \quad (\text{E1c})$$

The relaxational dynamics of the nematic tensor is governed by the “molecular tensor”:

$$\mathbf{H} = -\frac{\delta \mathcal{F}_{\text{LdG}}}{\delta \mathbf{Q}} + \frac{1}{3} \text{Tr} \left(\frac{\delta \mathcal{F}_{\text{LdG}}}{\delta \mathbf{Q}} \right) \mathbf{I}, \quad (\text{E2})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{\text{LdG}} = & \int dV \left[\frac{A}{2} \text{Tr} \mathbf{Q}^2 + \frac{B}{3} \text{Tr} \mathbf{Q}^3 + \frac{C}{4} (\text{Tr} \mathbf{Q}^2)^2 \right] \\ & + \frac{L}{2} \int dV |\nabla \mathbf{Q}|^2 + \frac{W}{2} \int dA \text{Tr} (\mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{Q}_0)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E3})$$

is the Landau-de Gennes free energy [5] augmented by the Nobili-Durand anchoring energy [27] with preferred nematic tensor $\mathbf{Q}_0$. The tensor

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S} = & (\xi \mathbf{u} + \boldsymbol{\omega}) \cdot \left(\mathbf{Q} + \frac{1}{3} \mathbf{I} \right) \\ & + \left(\mathbf{Q} + \frac{1}{3} \mathbf{I} \right) \cdot (\xi \mathbf{u} - \boldsymbol{\omega}) \\ & - 2\xi \left(\mathbf{Q} + \frac{1}{3} \mathbf{I} \right) \text{Tr}(\mathbf{Q} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E4})$$

embodies the interaction between local orientation and flow. Finally, the stress tensor $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\sigma} = & -P \mathbf{I} + 2\eta \mathbf{u} \\ & - \xi \mathbf{H} \cdot \left(\mathbf{Q} + \frac{1}{3} \mathbf{I} \right) - \xi \left(\mathbf{Q} + \frac{1}{3} \mathbf{I} \right) \cdot \mathbf{H} \\ & + 2\xi \left(\mathbf{Q} + \frac{1}{3} \mathbf{I} \right) \text{Tr}(\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{H}) \\ & + \mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{H} - \mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{Q} + \boldsymbol{\sigma}^E, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E5})$$

where:

$$P = P_0 - \frac{L}{2} |\nabla \mathbf{Q}|^2, \quad (\text{E6})$$

is the total pressure and:

$$\sigma_{ij}^E = -\partial_j Q_{kl} \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}_{\text{LdG}}}{\delta \partial_i Q_{kl}}, \quad (\text{E7})$$

the Ericksen stress. For a two-dimensional system with of uniform density and nematic order parameter Eqs. (E1) reduce to Eq. (A1) with $\Gamma = 9S^2/(2\gamma)$, $\xi = 3\lambda S/(S+2)$, and $K = 9LS^2/2$. The following parameter values have been used in our simulations: $A = -0.172 \times 10^6 \text{ Jm}^{-3}$, $B = -2.12 \times 10^6 \text{ Jm}^{-3}$, $C = 1.73 \times 10^6 \text{ Jm}^{-3}$, $L = 4 \times 10^{-11} \text{ N}$, $W = 10^{-2} \text{ J/m}^2$, $\Gamma = 16 \text{ Pa s}^{-1}$. This yields the following values of the nematic order parameter $S_0 = 0.533$, nematic correlation length $\xi_N = 6.63 \text{ nm}$ and relaxational time scale $\tau_N = \xi_N^2/(\Gamma L) = 6.8 \times 10^{-8} \text{ s}$. Eqs. (E1) were numerically integrated using the hybrid lattice Boltzmann method [25, 28] with a 19 velocity lattice model and BGK collision operator [29]. The flow was driven by a pressure difference with an open boundary at the end of the channels. In studied regime, the fluid is nearly incompressible and small density gradients are only used to induce pressure difference in microchannels (P_0 is taken to be proportional to the density). Resolution of the numerical mesh is set to $1.5\xi_N = 10 \text{ nm}$, which still ensures that there is no pinning of the nematic defects to the mesh points [30].

Appendix F: Defect loops in 6- and 8-arm junctions

In Sec. IV we show that multiple point defects in the experiment occur through breaking the symmetry of the defect loops with charge -2 in a 6-arm junction and -3 in a 8-arm junction. In experiments, such loops are unstable and break into multiple point defects. The perfectly symmetric flows obtained in our numerical simulations allows to construct stable defect loops of topological charge $k = -2$ and -3 (Fig. 7). These loops span a much larger area compared to loops of topological charge $k = -1$. Such configurations are characterized by a homeotropic orientation of nematic at the center of a junction, surrounded by a loop of topological charge $-1/2$. If the flow speed is increased, the loops shrink in size, however they do not break apart. They are also resistant to asymmetrical perturbations of pressure regime. The occurrence of highly charged loops is dictated by the initial conditions of a simulation. In general, highly asymmetrical initial configurations have to be used to avoid highly charged loop configuration and observe multiple small loops. High charged loop configuration is favorable by the homeotropic surface anchoring. In much larger samples where the role of surface anchoring is reduced, such loops are expected to be much less stable.

Appendix G: Numerical simulations of odd-arm junction

Fig. 8 we show numerical simulations of junctions of odd number of nematic microchannels. In a 3-arm junction, the stagnation point occurs at the corner of the junction. In the regime of 2 outlet flows, a nematic $-1/2$




FIG. 8. Simulations of (A-D) 3 junctions and (E,F) 5 junctions of nematic microchannels. First column shows the flow profile with the colorbar representing the speed in a junction, and streamlines representing the velocity direction. Director field (blue rods) and scalar order parameter field (isosurface at $S = 0.4$) are drawn in a second column. In a 3-junction we show (A,B) regime of 2 inlet flows and (C,D) regime of two outlet flows. With two inlet flows in a 3-junctions there are no nematic defects. However, if there is only one inlet flow, the nematic forms a $-1/2$ defect line that is pinned to the corner of a junction (marked by a blue arrow in D). (E,F) 5-junction with 3 inlet flows. The center of the junction resembles a 4-junction and shows a small defect loop coinciding with the stagnation point.

pined defect line occurs at same corner. In a 5-arm junction, there are 2 stagnation points: one close to the center of the junction and one pinned to the corner like in a 3-arm junction. In Fig. 8 we show a 5-arm junction with 3 inlet flows and 2 outlet flows. The nematic configuration in such junction resembles the nematic configuration in a 4-arm junction with a small defect loop/point defect located at the position of a stagnation point with a 2-fold rotational symmetry.




FIG. 9. Hydrodynamic stagnation as a topological template for generation of defects with defined effective strengths. Arrangement of 1 defects constituting an effective charge of 2 (top row) and 3 (bottom row) undergo transformations under perturbations of the flow field.

Appendix H: Experimental Setup

All our experiments have been performed with 4'-pentyl-4-biphenylcarbo-nitrile, commonly known as 5CB (Synthon Chemicals). This is single component nematic liquid crystal for $18^\circ\text{C} < T < 33^\circ\text{C}$ and was used without any additional purification. The arms of the microfluidic devices have rectangular cross-section, with depth $d \approx 10 \mu\text{m}$ and width $w = 100 \mu\text{m}$. The length of each arm (15 mm), is much larger compared to the other two dimensions. The walls of the microfluidic arms were chemically treated with an aqueous solution of octadecyldimethyl(3-trimethoxysilylpropyl)ammonium chloride (DMOAP) to create a strong, homogeneous homeotropic surface anchoring. The channel was first filled with the DMOAP solution and then rinsed with deionized water (after ≈ 10 min), after which the anchoring conditions within the channels were stabilized by thermal treatment at 80°C for 15 min and at 110°C for 1 h. This yields homogeneous homeotropic surface anchoring conditions on all the sur-

faces. Our microfluidic devices were first filled with 5CB in the isotropic phase, and allowed to cool down to nematic phase at room temperature. Thereafter, we progressively increased the volume flow rate to observe the first appearance of the topological defects at the junction center. We vary the flow rate in the range $[0.01, 2.5] \mu\text{l/h}$ corresponding to a flow speed v ranging between $\approx 2 \mu\text{m/s}$ and 0.40 mm/s in each arm. Thus, for 5CB having bulk dynamic viscosity, $\eta \approx 50 \text{ mPa s}$ [24], the characteristic Reynolds number $\text{Re} = \rho vl/\eta$ ranged between 10^{-6} and 10^{-4} . Here, $\rho \approx 1025 \text{ kg/m}^3$ is the material density, and $l = 4wd/2(w+d) \approx 18 \mu\text{m}$ is the hydraulic diameter of the rectangular microchannels. The specific geometry of the higher strength defects (Fig. 9) was manipulated by adjusting the hydrodynamic flow using inbuilt flow profile routines of the microfluidic pumps used for this work (neMESYS, Cetoni GmbH, Germany).

The hydrodynamic stagnation point in each experiment was detected by epi-fluorescent video imaging of fluorescent tracers (mean diameter $2.5 \mu\text{m}$, $\lambda_{ex} = 506 \text{ nm}$, $\lambda_{em} = 529 \text{ nm}$) dispersed in the flowing NLC. As the particles approached the vicinity of the stagnation point, their speed diminished, and consequently, the residence time increased. Upon averaging the fluorescent intensity over multiple frames of the acquired video micrograph, the stagnation point appeared as a high intensity (bright) spot, relative to the surrounding region, due to the increased residence time of the particles in the stagnation point. For each experiment we toggled the microscopy modes (between epi-fluorescent and polarization optical microscopy) at quick successions ($\approx 0.5 \text{ s}$) to identify the corresponding position of the topological defects. Alongside, the fluorescent particles also served as tracers for the flow velocity measurements. The video micrographs were analyzed using a standard routines for tracking and trajectory analysis available through MATLAB. By keeping the tracer concentration very low, and by sonicating the dispersion freshly before each experiment, we ensured that the tracer particles did not self-assemble into bigger clusters in our experiments.

-
- [1] Nelson DR, Halperin BI (1979) Dislocation-mediated melting in two dimensions. *Phys. Rev. B* 19(5):2457-2484.
 - [2] Kibble TWB (1976) Topology of cosmic domains and strings. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* 9(8):1387-1398.
 - [3] Newton I (1713) *Philosophiæ naturalis principia mathematica: General scholium*.
 - [4] Batchelor GK (1967) *Introduction to fluid dynamics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK).
 - [5] de Gennes PG, Prost J (1995) *The physics of liquid crystals* (Oxford University Press, Oxford UK).
 - [6] Chaikin PM, Lubensky TC (2005) *Principles of condensed matter physics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK).
 - [7] Oswald P, Pieranski P (2005) *Nematic and cholesteric liquid crystals: concepts and physical properties illustrated by experiments* (CRC Press, Boca Raton FL).
 - [8] Kleman M, Lavrentovich OD (2007) *Soft matter physics: An introduction* (Springer, New York NY).
 - [9] Nabarro FRN (1987) *Theory of crystal dislocations* (Dover Publications, Mineola NY).
 - [10] Tinkham M (1996) *Introduction to superconductivity* (Dover Publications, Mineola NY).
 - [11] Chandrasekhar S, Ranganath GS (1986) The structure and energetics of defects in liquid crystals. *Adv. Phys.* 35:507.
 - [12] Saupe A (1973) Disclinations and properties of the director field in nematic and cholesteric liquid crystals. *Mol. Cryst. Liq. Cryst.* 21:211.
 - [13] Oseen CW (1933) The theory of liquid crystals. *Trans. Faraday. Soc.* 29:883.
 - [14] Williams C, Pieranski P, Cladis PE (1972) Nonsingular $s = +1$ screw disclination lines in nematics. *Phys. Rev.*

- Lett.* 29:90.
- [15] Meyer RB (1973) On the existence of even indexed disclinations in nematic liquid crystals. *Philos. Mag.* 27:405.
 - [16] Beris AN, Edwards BJ (1994) *Thermodynamics of flowing systems with internal microstructure* (Oxford University Press, Oxford UK).
 - [17] Wang X, Kim Y, Bokusoglu E, Zhang B, Miller DS, Abbott NL (2016) Experimental insights into the nanostructure of the cores of topological defects in liquid crystals. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 116(14):147801.
 - [18] Kamien RD (2002) The geometry of soft materials: a primer. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 74(4):953.
 - [19] Landau LD, Lifshitz EM, *Theory of elasticity* 3rd ed. (Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford UK).
 - [20] Sengupta A, Herminghaus S, Bahr C (2012) Opto-fluidic velocimetry using liquid crystal microfluidics. *Appl. Phys. Lett.* 101(16):164101.
 - [21] Kawasaki K (1984) Topological defects and non-equilibrium. *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.* 79:161 (1984).
 - [22] Denniston C (1996) Disclination dynamics in nematic liquid crystals. *Phys. Rev. B* 54(9):6272.
 - [23] Nelson D R (2002) *Defects and geometry in condensed matter physics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK).
 - [24] Sengupta A, Tkalec U, Bahr C (2011) Nematic textures in microfluidic environment. *Soft Matter* 7:(14)6542.
 - [25] Sengupta A, Tkalec U, Ravnik M, Yeomans J, Bahr C, Herminghaus S (2013) Liquid crystal microfluidics for Tunable Flow Shaping. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 110(4):048303.
 - [26] Batista VMO, Blow ML, da Gama MMT (2015) The effect of anchoring on the nematic flow in channels. *Soft Matter* 11(23):4674.
 - [27] Nobili M, Durand G (1992) Disorientation-induced disordering at a nematic-liquid-crystalsolid interface. *Phys. Rev. A* 46(10):R6174.
 - [28] Denniston C, Orlandini E, Yeomans J (2001) Lattice Boltzmann simulations of liquid crystal hydrodynamics. *Phys. Rev. E* 63(5):056702.
 - [29] Succi S (2001) *The lattice Boltzmann equation for fluid dynamics and beyond* (Clarendon Press, Oxford UK).
 - [30] Ravnik M, Žumer S (2009) Landaude Gennes modelling of nematic liquid crystal colloids. *Liq. Cryst.* 36(10):1201.